

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed June 8, 2009.

#### **I. Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 8, 2009, Claims 1-84 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-16, 19-44, 47-72 and 75-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064733) in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and DeBry and further in view of Jhingan (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0186851).

#### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Response hereby amend Claims 1, 29 and 57; cancel Claims 12, 14, 40, 42, 68 and 70; and add new Claims 91-96, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented, canceled or amended claims in a continuing or future application.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2009, Claims 1-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the limitation "remote user is allowed access to modify the proxy representation directly on the proxy server;" was rejected as being unclear.

The present Response hereby amends the claims so as to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Applicant respectfully submits that as amended, Claims 1-84 now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2009, Claims 1-16, 19-44, 47-72 and 75-84 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064733) in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and DeBry and further in view of Jhingan (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0186851).

## Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 currently defines:

1. *A method for sharing files with remote users, the method comprising:*  
*accepting, at a proxy server, a request from a file sharer to share a file in an original location with a remote user, the file located at a file source inside an internal private network of the file sharer, said private network having a firewall;*  
*accessing the file sharer's credentials that enable the proxy server to access the file in the original location at the file source inside said private network;*  
*retrieving the file from the original location to the proxy server by using said file sharer's credentials;*  
*generating a proxy representation for the file in the original location on the proxy server, the proxy representation associated with the remote user and storing location information of the file on the proxy server, wherein the location information is used to reference the file in the original location inside the internal private network;*  
*enabling access to the proxy representation for the remote user that resides externally with respect to the internal private network, wherein the remote user is allowed to modify the proxy representation on the proxy server;*  
*receiving one or more modifications to the proxy representation; and*  
*using the file sharer's credentials to update the file in the original location inside the internal private network from where the file was retrieved based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server by using the location information;*  
*wherein after the updating, when the file sharer accesses the file in the original location, changes to the proxy representation made by the remote user are reflected in the file in the original location; and*  
*wherein changes made by the file sharer to the file in the original location are reflected in the proxy representation provided to the remote user.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines a method for sharing a file in an original location within a private network of the file sharer with some remote user that is outside of this network. This is performed by creating a proxy representation of the file on a proxy server. This proxy server maintains a link & credentials for accessing & updating the original version stored on the file sharer's desktop. So if the file sharer edits the original file on the desktop, the remote recipient will see the changes since their link is essentially retrieving the file from file sharer's desktop. At the

same time, if the remote recipient edits the file using the link, the file sharer will also see the changes on his/her desktop since the changes are stored back to the original location.

Thus, Claim 1 defines a way for a user to truly share an original file with a remote user without sending multiple copies to each other, such that both the owner and the recipient user are able to modify the original file independently, while both users are seeing the changes the other made.

Gong teaches concurrent version control and information management of files sent as attachments through email. More specifically, an IMS server is described which keeps track of multiple versions of attachments mailed to multiple users. Thus, when a user sends an attachment, the IMS creates one master copy of the attachment and manages all the check-in, check-out and modification activities by the different users that have access to that attachment (Gong, par. [0009]). In this manner, the IMS keeps track of the many versions of the email attachment that are sent to multiple users.

DeBry teaches the methods for providing will-call certificates for guaranteeing authorization for a printer to retrieve a file directly from a file server upon request from a client. More particularly, DeBry describes a system where a client obtains a "will-call certificate" from a file source and then provides this certificate to a print server. The print server then uses the will-call certificate to print out the file directly from the file source. This way, the client system is able to print out the file without ever actually receiving a copy of the file (DeBry, Abstract).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Gong and DeBry describe features which are substantially different from the embodiment defined in Claim 1, as amended.

In Gong, an email server strips an attachment from a message, stores it in "local storage", sends a link to recipients, and recipients have some rights on the stored copy (view, edit, etc). In Gong, when a user sends a file stored on his/her desktop, e.g., the recipient receives a link to a copy maintained in email server's "local storage". If the sender then edits the original file on his/her desktop, the recipient will not see the changes. Similarly, if the recipient edits the copy in the email server's "local storage", the sender will not see the changes in the original file on his/her desktop.

In Claim 1, on the other hand, when the file sharer accesses the file in the original location, changes to the proxy representation made by the remote user are reflected in the file in the original location. At the same time, changes made by the file sharer are also reflected in the proxy representation provided to the remote recipient. Thus, rather than sending out an attachment copy and thereafter maintaining a master copy on the server's local storage (as disclosed in Gong),

Claim 1 actually enables share access to the original file in its original location on the user's network (by way of a proxy). This is performed by the proxy server having the credentials necessary to access the original file within the private network and by the proxy server logging into the private network and modifying the original file with the changes.

Accordingly, Gong fails to disclose the feature that when the file sharer accesses the file in its original location, changes to the proxy representation made by the remote user are reflected in the file in the original location; and wherein changes made by the file sharer to the file in the original location are reflected in the proxy representation provided to the remote user, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, DeBry was cited as disclosing some use of credentials to access files, however DeBry also fails to disclose the features discussed above. In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 29 and 57**

Claims 29 and 57, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19- 28, 30-39, 41, 42-44, 47-56, 58-67, 69, 71-72 and 75-84**

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19- 28, 30-39, 41, 42-44, 47-56, 58-67, 69, 71-72 and 75-84 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19- 28, 30-39, 41, 42-44, 47-56, 58-67, 69, 71-72 and 75-84 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**Claims 12, 14, 40, 42, 68 and 70**

Claims 12, 14, 40, 42, 68 and 70 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot any rejections as to these claims.

**V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed June 9, 2009, Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and DeBry and further in view of Jhingan (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0186851).

Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**VI. Additional Amendments**

The present Response hereby adds new Claims 91-96. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 91-96 are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 8, 2009

By: /Justas Geringson/  
Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800